

# Illinois U Library Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 287 Stations of the ABC Network



S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

## Can the U. N. Meet the Challenge of the Present Crisis?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

### Speakers

HERBERT H. LEHMAN

HOMER E. CAPEHART

### Interrogators

MARQUIS CHILDS

LLOYD H. NORMAN



## THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

on

"Do We Need the Old-Time Religion?"

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 16, NUMBER 37



\$5.00 A YEAR: 15c A COPY



# Town Meeting

VOL. 16 No. 37



## Can the U. N. Meet the Challenge of the Present Crisis?

The Broadcast of January 9, 1951, from 9:00 to 9:45 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Company Network, originated in the Department of Interior Auditorium, in Washington, D.C.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recording made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

### THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

**HERBERT H. LEHMAN**—Senator, Democrat of New York. Entering business upon graduation from college, he became vice-president of the J. Spencer Turner Co. in 1906, and a partner in the investment banking firm of Lehman Brothers, New York City, in 1908. He was commissioned a captain in the U. S. Army in 1917 and in 1919 he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. In 1928 he entered public service and was elected Lieutenant Governor of New York State, and in 1932 he was elected Governor, an office he held for four terms. He was appointed Director of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations, State Department, in 1942, and he served as the first Director General of UNRRA from 1943-46. He became Senator in 1949 and was re-elected to a full term in 1950. He is an active officer and director of many civic, philanthropic, religious and educational organizations.

**HOMER E. CAPEHART**—Manufacturer, farmer and Republican Senator from Indiana. He organized the Capehart Corporation in 1928, and in 1932, he became the vice-president of the Rudolph Wurlitzer Co. The same year he founded the Packard Manufacturing Corporation, manufacturing musical instruments. In addition to manufacturing operations, Senator Capehart operates an 1800 acre farm in Daviess County, Indiana. In May, 1942, he was elected 7th District Republican Chairman, and in 1944, U. S. Senator from Indiana. He is a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

### Interrogators

**MARQUIS CHILDS**—Syndicated columnist for United Features and *The New York Post*. He is the author of "Sweden—The Middle Way."

**LLOYD H. NORMAN**—A Washington correspondent for the *Chicago Tribune*.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Hall Publication Office, 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscription and single copy order to Town Hall, New York 18, N. Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); ten weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1951, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

# Can the U. N. Meet the Challenge of the Present Crisis?

**Moderator Denny:**

Good evening, neighbors. Yes, the great debate is on and Town Meeting fans are well prepared for it. Ever since our momentous meeting in San Francisco in April, 1945, when twelve thousand people packed the Civic Auditorium there and two thousand stood outside to hear our discussion of the subject "Can We Build a Lasting Peace Now?", we've kept our listeners up to date with discussions of every crucial issue in the complex pattern of world affairs.

At San Francisco, we pinned our hopes on the United Nations on the assumption that we had one world and therefore we should have one world organization. We've now discovered that, politically, we had two worlds in fundamental conflict, and the United Nations is a political organization. Our central question comes, then, "How Can the United Nations Meet the Challenge of This Crisis?" The major issue in this debate is how the non-communist nations will meet the continuing aggression of the communist force, both of them within the framework of the United Nations.

Six months ago, the non-communist nations took a firm united stand against aggression in Korea. On the verge of success the Chinese communists entered the fight and now about to drive the non-communist forces—largely United States forces—off the Korean peninsula. Since each member nation has reserved its sovereign rights under the charter, each nation is trying to decide what is to do.

We've heard recently from President Truman, former President Hoover, Governor Dewey, Senator Taft and others. Tonight, to help us decide, we have the counsel of two distinguished United States senators—the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman, Democrat, of New York, and the Honorable Homer E. Capehart, Republican, of Indiana. We hear first from the distinguished senator from New York, Senator Herbert H. Lehman.

**Senator Lehman:**

Mr. Denny, Senator Capehart, Friends: Before attempting to answer the questions that have been put to me, let me, first, state the nature of the challenge we, and the United Nations, are called upon to meet. This challenge falls into two parts: first, to find a way to discharge our primary obligation to maintain peace and security; second, failing in this, to mobilize world public opinion, to assist in the marshaling of world economic and military strength against an aggressor.

The present crisis in the United Nations is the direct result of the uncompromising policies consistently pursued by the Soviet Government. The maintenance of international peace and security through the United Nations depended, in the first instance, on the cooperation between the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council—the five great powers. If any one of these powers failed to cooperate, the machinery of the United Nations was bound to creak. If one great power turned aggressor the United Nations was bound to face a crisis. Under such circumstances the choice for other nations would

be clearly that of capitulation or resistance. And resistance might, of course, mean war. I still have the firm hope that the United Nations will be able, first, to restore and then to maintain international peace and security. When the Soviet Union recognizes the inevitability of the free world's resistance to aggression the Soviet may change its course.

But, should this hope be shattered, which we all pray will not be the case, the United Nations can certainly meet the second part of the challenge. If on the occasion of aggression the Security Council is blocked, either by the Soviet veto or by intolerable delays, then the General Assembly furnishes an essential instrument for mobilizing world public opinion and it facilitates the effective marshaling of the forces of the free world in a common cause. There are, in addition, within the framework of the United Nations, the regional pacts—the Atlantic Pact, the Military Defense Assistance Pact, the Rio Pact and others—all designed to marshal the strength of the free world against aggression.

The ability of the free world to withstand aggression depends, above all, on the determination of the United States and other free nations to make common cause in facing the menace of Soviet imperialism. The question was asked me whether it would not be better to defend ourselves, successfully, than to try and defend the whole world, unsuccessfully. The answer, my friends, is simple and unequivocal. We have no such choice. It is suicidal to think so. We must either stand together with the other free nations or we will fall separately.

It is absurd to dream, even for a moment, that we can be secure

if the rest of the world comes under the control of the Soviet Union. It is the most dangerous kind of concept to imagine that we can defend ourselves by trying to convert our nation into an impregnable fortress while abandoning the rest of the world. We do not have the men, the resources, or the materials to withstand the united weight and production potential of all the rest of the world under Soviet domination. To entertain such a defeatist notion would indicate a lack of both moral fiber and practical good sense. Under such conditions, we would either succumb from without or collapse from within. In fact, that is the master plan of the Kremlin—to separate us from our allies and then to destroy us separately. Our only possible course is through collective action, however difficult that may be of achievement.

The United States is the strongest of the free nations. The other free nations have a right to look to us for vigorous and wise leadership and cooperation. We, on our part, can expect the other free nations of the world to do their part, not only to make themselves strong, but to give a full measure of cooperation to the common cause. In order that the United States may be able to give adequate support both to the United Nations and to the regional pacts to which we are committed, we must promptly mobilize all of our human and material resources to the full extent required. We have no time to lose, in my opinion.

We must also encourage and help our allies and friends in Europe to strengthen their defenses. We must take all steps necessary to maintain our economic stability. And above all, we must achieve unity. Divided counsels will

trously weaken our support of the United Nations and render our own defenses ineffective. By taking the only steps open to us we can prevail and the United Nations can succeed in preserving the peace.

**Moderator Denny:**

Thank you, Senator Lehman. Now we will hear another viewpoint on this question from the Republican senator from Indiana, the Honorable Homer E. Capehart.

**Senator Capehart:**

Senator Lehman, Mr. Denny, Ladies and Gentlemen: I want to say at the outset of my opening statement that Senator Lehman inspires me in the hope and the prayer that the United Nations can meet the challenge of the present crisis. Both Senator Lehman and I want peace. Our differences in the method of achieving that objective. Unfortunately, his ability and its methods, up to the present moment, have failed. It could seem, then, under such circumstances, they might well listen to others. I am equally certain that none within the hearing of my voice, including Senator Lehman, holds much hope tonight for successful world peace through the functions of the United Nations under its present processes and leadership.

We do not have a truly United Nations. Russia and her satellites are not united with the other nations. In fact there are segments of the balance of the nations that are not united with others. There has been no leadership—for there has been no courage. Each member nation places its own self-interests above the cause for united action. It has failed to establish an international police force to carry out its dictums against

aggressors. It failed as a body to support its own action in Korea. It failed to declare Red China an aggressor in Korea.

It is an appeasement organization rather than a positive and determined organization demanding the world remain at peace. It has operated as a debating society. Its members like the policy of "let somebody else do it." And that "somebody else" is the United States in most every instance.

As a member of the United States Senate I voted for the United Nations. I sincerely felt then that it would be the means of terminating the hatreds that have caused the great wars of history. I am now convinced that the United Nations cannot succeed to that conclusion without drastic changes in its processes and, I hasten to add, changes in its personnel. The United States delegates to the United Nations are among those who should resign. They have lacked forcefulness and the diplomacy necessary to achieve a United Nations. We find England doing business with Red China and ready to support a United Nations membership for Red China. We find France offering serious opposition to the program for arming western Germany against communistic aggression.

We find only token help from member nations in our fight in Korea. We found our troops standing idle at the 38th parallel for 15 days awaiting a United Nations approval to cross that parallel. In those fifteen days a defeated Red Army was regrouped and Red Chinese armies were moved north in positions to launch the disastrous attack against our boys. At this very moment the United Nations is withholding from our military leaders the right

to bomb Red supply bases outside Korea.

Failure of the United Nations to meet the challenge of the present crisis is written in our own actions. Just 33 hours ago, the President of the United States advised the people of this nation that we must join with other free nations of the world, outside the United Nations, in the fight against communism. "We must form an international army," he said. That is what the United Nations was supposed to do. He said, "We must arm the free world to halt the aggressor—communism." In other words, the world is again choosing up sides and forming two armed camps. Either we must admit the faults of United Nations' processes and act at once to correct them, or we should admit the United Nations never can meet the challenge and get out of it.

**Moderator Denny:**

Thank you, Senator Capehart. Now, Senator Lehman, I believe you have a comment or question for the Senator from Indiana.

**Senator Lehman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Denny. It seems to me, Senator Capehart, from listening to your statement that you want to eat your cake and have it, too. You say that you are for the United Nations but apparently only if the United Nations does what you think the United Nations ought to do. You condemn the United Nations for failing to be sufficiently aggressive in its relationship to communist China. At the same time, you express the desire that the United Nations should preserve the peace. What could have been done, more practicably effective in relation to Red China, short of engaging in all out war? I ask you, Senator

Capehart, whether you, as a member of the Senate, would vote a declaration of war against Red China?

**Mr. Denny:** Senator Capehart: The microphone is yours, sir.

**Senator Capehart:** I believe the question is whether I would vote for a declaration of war against Red China. Let me say this, in the first place, I would never have been in Korea. I want to say this, that I certainly would vote for a declaration of war against China and I certainly would never stand by, as an American, and permit the Chinese, or any other nation, to bomb and kill American boys, and deny the American boys, and those American generals the right to go get them and kill them wherever they might be.

**Mr. Denny:** Before we take questions from our interrogators I believe you have a question Senator Lehman.

**Senator Capehart:** Well, my question to Senator Lehman is this. We're getting a little off the subject now. That question, of course, was completely off the subject but that was perfectly all right with me. As I said in my opening statement we both want peace and everybody here tonight wants peace. The fight, the argument or debate is on the best way to get that peace. What I want to ask Senator Lehman is this: Would we send a sizeable army of American troops into western Europe before war actually is begun, when those same nations, those sixteen nations, plus Germany—and we now occupy two thirds of Germany—are capable and were capable in World Wars I and II, to place into the field 250 divisions plus the one hundred

divisions that Germany is capable of putting into the field. Now, why should we send American boys to Europe, when those nations over there, who have more population and more productive facilities today than they did during World Wars I and II, why should we send American boys over there, when they're capable themselves of putting into the field no less than 350 divisions?

**Mr. Denny:** Senator Lehman.

**Senator Lehman:** I am very glad to answer that question. The European nations went through the horrors of war of which we, in this country, have no appreciation. They're destroyed physically; they're destroyed economically; they're destroyed spiritually; and it is only in the last year and a half or two years through the help—thank God!—of the Marshall Plan, that they have had a chance of obtaining at least partial recovery. I can see perfectly plainly, I don't need to ask him a question, that my friend and respected colleague, Senator Capehart, is a supporter of the proposals made by former President Herbert Hoover, who asks us, in language that cannot possibly be misunderstood, to withdraw our help from Europe and seek isolationism in this country— isolationism which has never worked and never will work. I can say to you, my friends, that if we withdraw from Europe as has been proposed and allow the Soviet powers to come to the channel—to secure the productive capacity of France and Holland and Belgium and then of England—we'll have no chance of survival in this country. The figures show that, if the Soviet Government wins that production potential, they will have production greater than we can possibly muster even

though we may not suffer physical harm from this war. To me, it is a defeatist policy, which, in my opinion, cannot be defended, and I believe it would be the most serious and dangerous thing if the people of this country ever lent themselves to the acceptance of that policy.

**Mr. Denny:** Senator Capehart.

**Senator Capehart:** I dislike to say this very much, but former President Hoover has been very, very much misrepresented. President Hoover, Senator Taft, or myself, or no one else has ever advocated abandoning Europe. We are advocating a different method, a different way of helping to prevent the spread of communism. At no time—no one can read into President Hoover's speech in any way, that he was advocating withdrawal. What he said was that we ought to guarantee the 100 per cent cooperation of our air force, of our navy, and that the European nations themselves ought to furnish the great majority of the ground troops. Now, no one can object to that. No one can find fault with that. Because the one thing that they can furnish is ground troops. The one thing that we can furnish is air support and naval support. So it gets back at all of these arguments. Senator Lehman's party has been running this government for twenty years. They have been given a free hand. His party has been running the government, now, during three wars. The last 33 years we've had three wars; they've been under Democratic administrations. Now, they can't get away from that fact. Why aren't they willing to listen to the advice and the recommendations of others? Why is it, that in every instance, in every debate

we get into, they call those who disagree with them isolationists—those that disagree with them, as adopting a policy that might well lead to disaster, when the facts remain that their own policies tonight are leading to disaster? The best proof of that is what is happening in Korea.

**Mr. Denny:** Thank you, Senator Capehart. I know that you and Senator Lehman could carry this on indefinitely but I think we had better take some questions from our interrogators. We'll start with Mr. Lloyd Norman, Washington correspondent for the *Chicago Tribune*, who has a question.

**Mr. Norman:** Senator Lehman, the question, that you raise about survival of the United States—have you considered the problem of the United States attempting to fight all over the world, in every corner of the globe? Wouldn't that bleed us white in the same way?

**Senator Lehman:** Of course it would, if we attempted to fight all over the world. There has never been any such suggestion made. The whole policy of the State Department and of the Administration has been to build up areas of strength, where we could defend ourselves. May I say that Senator Capehart has brought in the Democratic party and Republican party here. This isn't a question of Democrats or Republicans; it's a question of Americans. We have, among our most effective and powerful advisors, men like Warren Austin, a great former Senator; Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, one of the great men of my time, and Senator Vandenburg of Michigan. All these were Republicans. I think it is unfortunate and misleading to the people of this country when we try to in-

volve any discussion into considerations of politics. In explanation of Senator Capehart's statement, and, I think, the implication of yours, that former President Hoover has been misrepresented I'm just going to, in 15 seconds, quote the exact words that were contained in his speech. I read and I quote, "We should not land another soldier, nor send another dollar to Europe, until western Europe itself organizes and equips combat divisions of such number as would erect a sure dam against the Red tide." Now, if we wait for them to erect a sure dam against the flood of the Red tide, they don't need us. We need them and they need us. It's a cooperative effort between us, one on which we must have their help and they must have our help, and we must encourage and help them to set up the kind of defense organization which will be effective.

**Mr. Denny:** Thank you, Senator Lehman. Now a question from Mr. Marquis Childs, syndicate columnist of Washington. Mr. Childs.

**Mr. Childs:** I'd like to ask Senator Capehart a question. He referred in his prepared talk about other nations following a "let somebody else do it" policy, and that "somebody" being the United States. I wonder if Senator Capehart isn't aware that the French have had 150 thousand troops in Indo-China, trying to hold the line against communism; the British have had 20 thousand to 30 thousand in Malaya and others in Hong Kong, trying to hold the tide against communism. Isn't that part of the world-wide effort Senator?

**Senator Capehart:** I think it is and I have no quarrel with it, and I congratulate them upon doing it.

at I still stand with the statement that I made, namely, and I don't believe that you can successfully contradict it, that in every instance Uncle Sam picks up the check. Uncle Sam is furnishing practically all the troops in Korea. Uncle Sam is paying the bill. And I think that is true in practically every instance. I have no particular quarrel with it. I think we should help and we want to help. We're now faced—we're in

war tonight. We're not faced with war, we're at war tonight. We are threatened with world-wide communism. I think it is a co-operative effort, and I think that other nations ought to do more than they have been doing in the past, and I think they ought to offer to do more than they're doing at the moment.

**Mr. Denny:** Thank you, Senator Capehart. Now we start with the question period in the audience.

---

## QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

**Man:** Senator Lehman, does the present Acheson revision of the General Assembly procedure provide the necessary structure for a non-communist majority to maintain peace?

**Senator Lehman:** I can only say—I wish I had more time to answer you—up to the present time, of course, the Security Council could block action. Today, action can be taken by the Assembly.

**Lady:** Senator Capehart, since we have won only a little breather time between wars since 1914, do you not think that the only real victory is to make the United Nations work?

**Senator Capehart:** Oh, I wish it could make it work. I wish it would work. I voted for it, and I think it would be a grand thing if it would work. But, unfortunately, up until this time, up to this moment, it has not worked. I do not see how you can possibly make it work as long as Russia and her satellites are members of the United Nations because they veto everything the United Nations tries to do.

**Mr. Childs:** Senator Lehman,

don't you think that this is largely an academic discussion? Haven't we made the commitment in the North Atlantic Pact to form an international army, the kind of army which Senator Capehart was complaining the UN had not formed?

**Senator Lehman:** We certainly have and if we didn't carry out that commitment we would be welshing on a solemn commitment.

**Senator Capehart:** I'd like to say just a word on that subject. We are only committed to defend, or protect, or go to the help of, those nations in case of war. I hold it in my hand, but I shall not take the time to read, the statement by Senator Connally, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, in which, when it was being debated on the floor of the United States Senate, both assured the senators and the people of the United States that our joining the Atlantic Pact in no way meant that we'd send a single soldier to Europe unless they were attacked. If I had the time I'd read their exact words.

**Lady:** Senator Lehman, isn't it

a mistake to regard the United Nations as merely a political organization and ignore the humanitarian, educational, conservationist activities of UNESCO, of the world health organization, of the food and agricultural organization, of the children's emergency fund?

*Mr. Denny:* That's a very good speech, madam, and we appreciate your bringing those points out, but that's not germane to the question tonight. We're asking about meeting this crisis. Thank you very much, next question.

*Man:* Senator Capehart, due to the fact that the American people have an awful lot to lose as a result of the activities of the communist regime, don't you think that we also should be willing to send our men overseas, to fight in the war?

*Senator Capehart:* I think we should in case of war, but I question whether we should send them over there, at the moment, in view of the fact, that all of the western democracies, or western Europe, only have 15 divisions. Now, as I said, a moment ago, during World War I and II they put into the field 250 divisions and, with Germany, they're capable of putting 350 divisions. My point is, they ought to furnish the ground troops; we ought to furnish the air force and the naval force and the materials and a certain amount of money. They ought themselves to furnish the ground forces.

*Lady:* Mr. Lehman, do you think the UN has the power to establish an economic blockade of the Soviet Union?

*Senator Lehman:* I think the United Nations has that power. Whether they would decide to do it or not I can't answer. They

certainly would take into consideration the effect that such blockade would have in carrying out their hopes for peace and possibly effectuating peace.

*Mr. Norman:* Senator Capehart, you mentioned in your statement that you would favor the resignation of the UN delegates. And all, these delegates do follow the line put down by the White House and the State Department. Wouldn't you ask someone else to resign then?

*Senator Capehart:* Well, I have always advocated, and will continue to advocate, that Secretary of State Acheson should resign.

*Lady:* Senator Lehman, how can the United States settle the Korean situation as long as China is represented in the United Nations by the Nationalists?

*Senator Lehman:* Well, I think that the United Nations is going to consider the merits of the case that is before them. I don't think the mere fact that the Nationalists' representative sits on the United Nations necessarily means that he has any more effect in the consideration of questions coming before the United Nations than any other delegate. The United Nations can, of course, vote to continue the representation by the Nationalist regime or by the representative of the Communist regime in China. They decide it. At least for the time being, I don't know how long it will last, I have no information on that, the representation of the existing government is the Nationalist government of China.

*Mr. Childs:* Senator Capehart, you fired Secretary Acheson and all the US delegation to the UN. Whom would you name as Secretary of State?

*Senator Capehart:* That's not my responsibility and . . .

*Mr. Childs:* No, I know it isn't Senator, that's the trouble. You haven't taken the responsibility, nor your party hasn't in all these years.

*Senator Capehart:* Let me say this to you, that in any business, any home or any organization any place, if the men leading that business or organization or home, had had as many failures behind them, had adopted as many foreign schemes as our people have, that have failed to accomplish the purpose for which they were intended, they ought to get out and they ought to resign and they ought to let somebody else take their place.

*Mr. Childs:* Well, you might say that about your party having lost so many elections, Senator. I don't say it at all. I'd like to see your party make a comeback, but I want to see the constructive side. I wish you could name three men who would be good Secretaries of State.

*Senator Capehart:* I suppose I could name a hundred. I'll name Hoover, and I'll name Taft, and I'll name Dewey, and I'll name . . .

*Mr. Childs:* John Foster Dulles?

*Senator Capehart:* I would not name Dulles. No.

*Man:* Mr. Lehman, could not the UN better meet the present crisis if Communist China were a member and continuously available for consultation at the UN?

*Senator Lehman:* I can't answer that question. I can say this, that I think the United Nations could very well have considered seating Communist China six months ago. I think that it may very well be that they can consider

seating Communist China at some time in the future. I certainly do not believe that the United Nations should seat Communist China under threat and under the actual existence of aggression, such as we are suffering from at the present time.

*Man:* Senator Capehart, would a new non-communist organization have a better chance of meeting the crisis than has the UN?

*Senator Capehart:* I certainly think it would. I don't see how the present United Nations, as long as Russia is a member of it, can possibly meet the crisis. Yes, I would strongly recommend an organization of nations, that believe in free people, and that are against communism, forming together into an association of nations. And, of course, that's exactly what you have, at the moment, in the Atlantic Pact.

*Mr. Norman:* Senator Lehman, isn't the Atlantic Pact idea, that the Truman administration has fostered, a revival of the balance of power that the British tried for many years and that didn't work too well?

*Senator Lehman:* I don't know about that, but I can say this—and I have to say it very hurriedly—that if you allow Russia to come to the Channel, grab off all of western Europe and England, you're going to have an increase in Russian production, industrial production, shipping production, that will make it impossible for us to survive. Instead of having the great superiority which we have today in production in this country, you will be yielding the superiority of production to Russia. And I'm against it.

*Mr. Norman:* Mr. Lehman, why do you feel that these allies are

so strong if we help them, and yet, so weak if we don't help them.

*Senator Lehman:* Let me tell you this. We've been hearing a lot about the lack of cooperation which we have received from the allies. I wonder whether you know that the western European countries today have a larger proportion of their population under arms than we have in the United States.

*Mr. Childs:* Well, I was just going to ask Senator Lehman another question. Isn't it true that Senator Taft is, in effect, advocating a balance of power position? Today, I heard him in the Press Club urge that we play the same role in the world that Great Britain played as "order keeper." Do you think that's a pretty valid concept, or no?

*Senator Lehman:* Well, I didn't hear the speech, of course, but I should think there was a great deal of validity in your statement. I didn't hear the speech.

*Mr. Norman:* Senator Capehart, do you think anything would be accomplished by revising the UN setup to expel Russia?

*Senator Capehart:* Oh, I think if it's going to be successful that you'll either have to expel Russia—and there is no way you can expel a member nation—or you're

going to have to set up a separate organization. In fact that's exactly what you have today, because the United Nations—what little functioning it is doing—it is doing without Russia. And I think you'll eventually have to do that.

*Man:* Senator Lehman, if you favor supporting those nations willing to oppose aggression how do we justify our non-support of nationalist China when China was invaded by the communists?

*Senator Lehman:* Well, I think that the answer is that we didn't think that nationalist China merited our support. Nationalist China was very strong. They had four or five million people under arms. They were fighting with our arms, with our equipment, and the four or five million people there were under control of Chiang Kai Shek surrendered to the communist forces. They didn't fight. We didn't stop them. We helped them and continued to help them, but they gave up and I don't think they merit the support that you have suggested in your question.

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you, Senator Lehman, Senator Capehart, Mr. Childs and Lloyd Norman. This discussion will be continued in our future Town Meetings.

Plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.

## AMERICAN LEADERS COMMENT ON TOWN MEETING AND ITS EXTENSION TO 45 MINUTES

"There never has been a time of greater need for a complete understanding of the critical issues with which we are now faced. America's Town Meeting, through a full discussion of these issues by informed people, can make a great contribution to such understanding. If there is enough discussion we will come out with the right answers. We always have and we always will. I am delighted that the program has been increased to 45 minutes."—**AUL G. HOFFMAN**, President, Ford Foundation.

"I am delighted that Town Meeting will be broadcast 45 minutes. At these times of grave crisis such a step is of great public importance and I am sure has the hearty approval of your many millions of listeners who are anxious to hear the fullest possible discussion of current issues."—**SENATOR WAYNE MORSE**.

"America's Town Meeting has rendered a great educational service to the people of our nation and has served to clarify many critical issues. It has helped the American people to find the right answers to complicated questions at this period of world confusion."—**WILLIAM GREEN**, President, A. of L.

"I am glad that America's Town

Meeting is to have more time each week for discussion of critical issues affecting our country during this national emergency. We need now as never before in our history clear-headed thinking by a united American public, cutting through the attempts of enemy propaganda to divide our people and create confusion. Town meeting can make a major contribution to the forming of sound public opinion by continuing to present constructive views of responsible leaders on the grave problems we face."—**JAMES A. FARLEY**.

"I heartily recommend free discussion of current issues through America's Town Meeting, for these issues must be the concern of an informed citizenry if we are to make right decisions."—**THE RIGHT REV. HENRY KNOX SHERRILL**, President of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

"Speaking as an American citizen, it seems to me Town Meeting has rendered a very real service in making millions of our people conscious of our country's crucial problems in this critical period. It has certainly made a very definite contribution to the maintenance of our freedom."—**H. M. PRENTIS, JR.**, Board Chairman Armstrong Cork Company.

# THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

on

"DO WE NEED THE OLD-TIME RELIGION?"

Program of January 2, 1951

Speakers

Mr. William Graham and Dr. Ralph Sockman

---

*Each week we print as many significant comments on the preceding Tuesday's broadcast as space allows. You are invited to send in your opinions, pro and con. The letters should be mailed to Department Town Hall, New York 18, N. Y., not later than Thursday following the program. It is understood that we may publish any letters or comments received.*

---

## DEFINITION, PLEASE

If old-time religion means competitively dressing up God in silks, satins, laces, gold, and jewels, then I'm against it. If it means white churches and colored churches, then ditto. If it means God accepts limited beliefs as sufficient to salvation, then I can't go along with it. If it means reverting back to fear psychology or emotional and memorized conventional prayer, or fanatical worship of or through mediums, I'm to be counted out. But if it means establishing and building a place of worship within oneself, I'm for that. Also, if it means God everywhere, in and out of churches, as a formless Being whom we cannot dress in denominational or sectarian raiment, then most of us are for the old-time religion.—M. J. QUAKER, Rutland Heights, Massachusetts.

Christ's birth nearly two thousand years ago brings to mind the absurdity of calling any but the Catholic, the "old-time religion." —JOHN HINKS, Upper Fairmount, Maryland.

Which old-time religion? Catholicism, Presbyterianism, or any one of the other varieties? In my opinion the topic should be "Do

we need any religions to be humane, or are our religions a hindrance to the advancement of humanity?" Religion cannot end war, famine, and disease, or increase earthly happiness, or wipe out human suffering. Man can. M. STEMPE, Audubon, New Jersey.

I am somewhat at a loss as to the meaning of the title. . . . Is there such a thing as an old-time or new-time religion? It seems to me that America and the whole world needs an *all time* religion. THADDEUS C. SMITH, Norfolk, Virginia.

I am in my sixties. When I was a girl we were exhorted to return to old-time religion. My mother, in her nineties, has told me of such exhortations when she was a girl. How ancient can you get? How far must one go back to old-time religion?—INEZ W. CALWELL, San Diego, California.

## PRO AND CON

The fact that people in trouble either commit suicide or turn to God for consolation, I think, establishes the fact that we still need the God of our fathers . . . and the old-fashioned religion.—MARGARET ADAMS, Springfield, Illinois.

There is no place in the world today for the old-time religion. To bring it back would be comparable to bringing back the old horse and buggy on modern highways with the fast moving cars. Such a vehicle on the highway would endanger the life of man and beast. . . . (Also) there is no place in the world today for pre-  
day religious dogmatic beliefs which separate mankind. — B. B. AGHORN, Columbia, Missouri.

It was a wonderful program, and I say we need revival! Let's be done with all these substitutes for good living and get back to Jesus Christ's way of living. It's the only way, and Christ will recognize no other way.—ETHEL W. FITCH, Iron Hill, Pennsylvania.

The old-time religion expressed emotion in a way the twentieth century has no logical manner of constraining. When emotional performances caused certain ends to be served for the so-called uplift communities and societies . . . great criticism had reason to be pressed against it. But now when exaltation has lifted . . . us to peer mountain tops of values in ecstatic living, true religion should be the handmaiden of education toward truth. . . . All of this cannot be encompassed in synagogues, cathedrals, temples, or mandated places of any kind. . . . The religion is a personal attainment. It has very little, if anything, to do with shouting in a revival tent. — MRS. WILLIAM E. GODOCK, Lawrence, Kansas.

That old-time religion, very emotional, very primitive, and shockingly cruel, incorporating the belief in a fiery hell and a personal devil, can save humanity . . . is too absurd even to discuss.—KYLE F. CLOW, Los Angeles, California. I am sixteen years of age and am

much concerned with the problems which our nation faces and the right answer to them. The reason why I say "answer" and not "answers" is that there is only one answer, and that is . . . the Lord Jesus Christ.—JOHN L. GILMORE, Pittston, Pennsylvania.

### BROAD OR NARROW?

What particularly offended me was the assumption, which nobody seemed to question, that religion meant Christianity, and that there was no such thing as religion outside the borders of the Christian faith. I count this an outrage. Think of Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Confucianism, to say nothing of Mahatma Gandhi, and his contribution to the thought and life of these times. Not only was everything discarded from your platform except Christianity, but this Christianity was limited to the very narrowest interpretation of its meaning.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, New York City.

(Dr. Holmes is Minister Emeritus of the Community Church of New York.—Ed.)

In all the years I have listened to Town Meeting, I have never heard as magnificent a program as I have tonight. Thank you for presenting such a broad and many-sided picture of Christianity today. HELEN M. BRUNER, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

### LIBERALS—OMITTED OR UNITED?

Your discussion was not a fair one because you did not oppose the speakers with men who held liberal or unorthodox opinions. . . . We were hearing only one side of this question. — C. VAN WEELDEN, Grand Haven, Mich.

With leading conservative and liberal Protestants joining in the presentation of America's des-

perate need of religious awakening, it was most satisfactory to note the basic unity . . . of agreement on the fundamentals of Christian faith. . . . Protestants are not as divided as some would like to think.—REV. T. E. PAUL, Shillington, Pennsylvania.

### THE VALUE OF FEAR

As a Christian, born again in Christ Jesus, I can testify to the truth of the fact that Christ provides the answer and meets the needs of any man who will seek Him. For as one who was once without Christ, but now have Him as Lord and Saviour for now and eternity, I know what has been the result in my own life, and know the difference between the life without, and the life with Christ as a constant daily companion. . . . As to the element of fear in Christianity, or the fate of the unsaved, it might be well to point out that this element is God's alternative as given in the Bible, and not man's. . . . The value of fear as used to speed people to doctors in cancer advertising, coupled with the benefits of so doing, represents the same value of fear coupled with God's promises, to speed people to Him. As in cancer, so in Christianity, neglect will result in death, the one physical, but the other more deadly, for it is the eternal death

of the spirit. This is not a passing away to nothingness, but a torment and lasting torture. . . . Draw again from the illustration of cancer advertising, the right amount of play on fear makes people realize that immediate action is necessary, and any delay may be serious. Should the use of fear be any more legitimate in our Gospel message than in secular advertising, where it is thus properly used?—DONALD C. EDWARDS, Amherst, Massachusetts.

### ENTHUSIASTIC LISTENER

Let me applaud you most enthusiastically for last night's Town Meeting. It was the best I've ever heard, and I'm a pretty faithful listener. We had friends in for the evening, and the resulting broadcast session lasted several hours. I think the excellence of the program can be attributed to several things: the subject was the closest to every listener, whether he admits it or not; all the questions were honest, intelligent, and stimulating; and there was no evasion on the speakers' part. I had never heard Billy Graham speak and was tremendously impressed. I have heard Dr. Soeman hundreds of times, but can't hear him enough. All in all, it was superb. — CHARLOTTE BLOUNT, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

### RECORD MAIL

Since the January 2 broadcast, audience mail has poured into the Town Meeting office. By Tuesday, January 9, the mail totaled 16,200, setting an all-time record as the largest audience response to any one program in Town Meeting history.